

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,589	WEYAND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert A. Hopkins	1724	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Robert A. Hopkins.

(3) _____.

 (2) Lee Kim.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 January 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1 and 3

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the ~~Notice of Allowability~~ Continuation Sheet of Interview Summary.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that the amendment to lines 8 and 9 of claim 1 seemed to change the scope of the claim and differed from what was disclosed in the specification and drawing. Examiner and attorney agreed to change the amended claim language in lines 8 and 9 to the originally recited claim language. Also, Examiner noted that the method step of claim 3 seemed to recite an additional step to the method steps of claim 1, and wherein such an additional step was not disclosed by the specification and drawings. Examiner noted, after reading portions of the specification and looking at the drawing, that the method step of claim 3 actually seemed to further limit the method step of claim 1 lines 10-11 reciting "separating said powdered activated carbon from said mercury at an elevated temperature and in an inert gas environment". Examiner and attorney agreed to include the limitations --separating said powdered activated carbon from said mercury by -- after "including" in claim 3 in order to connect the method step of claim 3 to the method steps of claim 1. .